

I find it hard to believe ---- At last! Someone from the ARRL admitting

he is OLD, CROTCHETY, and SET IN HIS WAYS!! (:>

--

Ed Naratil

(All standard disclaimers apply)

Amateur Packet: w3bnr@N3LA.#epa.PA.USA.NA

ean@VFL.Paramax.COM

Date: 16 Jul 93 12:46:00 GMT

From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!ra!cs.umd.edu!

nocusuhs!Pt!skates.gsfc.nasa.gov!nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov!stocker@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

[stuff deleted]

>All the ARRL members can get on this group and tell us we're wrong in our
>assumptions, but they have to. I'll be upgrading when I hit a VE session
>in about 3 weeks, and I don't think I'm going to bother with the ARRL at
>that point in time either. Not after being such an outcast to their
>community. However, since amateur radio is such a service to the
>community, I'd like to remind them that the majority of people doing
>public service events around my area are no-codes. Not all, but a
>majority. I guess maybe the ARRL managers would rather be nice and
>comfortable sitting in their shacks rag-chewing on HF while we prove to
>congress why we deserve the band-width.

>

>73 de N8VUR / Doug

>floyd@nraven.wariat.org

>QSO on 146.82/R anytime!

When the republican party wins the seat in my district, my democratic political views are not represented directly either. However, that shouldn't and wouldn't keep me from communicating my views to the congressman.

Generally, I think the ARRL has kept a relatively balanced role. They don't get way out front of the membership but they are not trailing behind it either. Personally, I have always been able to get help from the league even before I was a ham.

As far as them currently having a no code basis, I dispute that. They were the ones that told me such a license even existed (I never knew a change had occurred since my first interest during the 60s.) They continue to provide information to member and non member alike. The QST lists many more advanced and extra class licensees with violations than technician. Anyway this is a reporting of fact not an anti no code technician view.

The league does encourage upgrading. I would hate to think that they wouldn't. I became a ham with the intent to upgrade, so I don't have any difficulty with their encouragement.

I do feel that the issue of the code's role in differentiation among the incentive classes needs to be relooked. Others disagree, but I never felt that league reps discriminated against me because I don't think 20wpm is what ought to make someone an extra class.

I don't think that the league needs to agree with everything I think. If they disagree I wouldn't quite but just continue to try to convince the leadership and a larger group of the membership that my views have merit. I strongly support league membership for all radio hams. Just as I strongly support AMSAT membership for all hams interested and using satellites.

We are stronger in numbers than alone. However, being part of the group does not take away our right to voice non-group opinions.

Erich
N3OXM

Date: 20 Jul 93 09:45:15 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>Why do I have a feeling that 20 years from now we'll still be debating
>inane issues of the no-code history and the only new hams will be on
>VHF/UHF repeaters. Not because they're too lazy to learn Morse code, but
>because they won't be allowed to have outdoor antennas. While we fight
>amongst ourselves, our undoing is likely to be in the making. I just hope
>Phase 3D and follow ons are as effective as they say, because the only DX
>many hams will be able to do is from a hand held.

>Stop whining and arguing about the past and figure out how to save the
>future. We could learn a *lot* from the NRA.

Todd,

One of the reasons that Jon and I jumped into this is because the thread evolved into an "ARRL is not good for ham radio -- look at how they mishandled the no-code proposal." Various posters then

got on and presented all sorts of inaccurate positions about how we were pro-no-code, anti-no-code, in bed with the FCC and/or our advertisers, etc.

Many people will make their decision about supporting or not supporting the ARRL based on their perception of how we have conducted ourselves in the past. I would like to ensure that reality is not clouded by some of the inaccurate information or sweeping generalities that have cropped up on this thread.

I wholeheartedly support your opinion that it is more important to address the burning issues of TODAY rather than dwell too strongly on the past issues of incentive licensing and no-code. To do this effectively, amateurs need to work together more than they do. IMHO, the ARRL is the best-available mechanism to do that, complete with its present structure and flaws. The sweeping generalities that ARRL is the best thing in the world for ham radio or that it is the worst are both incorrect. In reality, there are some things we do well, some that we do poorly and some that we don't do at all.

Unfortunately, when you stop to realize that 90% of the work is done by 1% of the amateur community, it is not surprising that some of the other 99% are not happy with the process or the outcome. You may be happy or unhappy (or indifferent) with the actions of your Director, SM or the ARRL HQ staff, but do not forget that they are the ones willing to stand up and do it, week after week. (My email IN basket has had some evidence of the good things YOU do, so keep it up!)

If only all amateurs were willing to pitch in and help, and be part of the process, we would probably find that the end product, and our effectiveness in dealing with complex and difficult issues, would be increased by an order of magnitude or so.

73 from ARRL HQ, EdN

Ed Hare, KA1CV
American Radio Relay League
225 Main St.
Newington, CT 06111
(203) 666-1541 - voice
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor
RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing

ehare@arrl.org

"The goal of every engineer is to retire without getting blamed for a major catastrophe." -- Scott Adams and Dilbert

Date: 20 Jul 93 21:50:46 GMT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Order pizza on your autopatch now
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, dave@llondel.demon.co.uk (David Hough) writes:
>In article <22dsa9\$214@sun1.clark.net> andy@clark.net (Andrew M. Cohn) writes:
>> David Hough (dave@llondel.demon.co.uk) wrote:
>> : In article <22ar7e\$km9@access.digex.net> bote@access.digex.net (John Boteler)
writes:
>> : > *ordering food*. This is not a drill, it actually
>> : > says ordering food is no longer restricted.
>> : >
>> : > So be the first on your repeater to order a pizza over
>> : > the autopatch, preferably for the next ham club meeting! :)
>> : >
>> : Does this mean that people can't endlessly debate whether it is legal
>> : anymore? What will they all moan about now? I daresay someone will try and
>> : abolish CW next :-)
>>
>> Knowing that it is OK to order PIZZA via autopatch, the NEXT debate will
>> be whether it's also OK to order a burger and fries instead. ; > K4ADL
>>
>OK.... try this one:
>
>If ordering food, does it have to be for the consumption of the licensee?
>Can you order food on behalf of (a) another ham and (b) an unlicensed person?
>
>Dave
>
>*****
>* G4WRW @ GB7WRW.#41.GBR.EU AX25 * You think *you* have problems? *
>* dave@llondel.demon.co.uk Internet * What do you do if you *are* *
>* g4wrw@g4wrw.ampr.org Amprnet * a manically depressed robot?? *
>*****
>

Well, since the US doesn't have a Third-Party agreement with
the UK, except under certain conditions, it's definitely not
okay for a US ham to use a 10-meter repeater to order fish and
chips from England. :-} <-- For humorless readers

Who will be the first ham to order a pizza via autopatch? It's
something I've hungered to do for many years.

KR1S

Date: 20 Jul 1993 18:16:41 GMT

From: korie!male.EBay.Sun.COM!twobeers!ket@ames.arpa
Subject: Order pizza on your autopatch now
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 743129271snx@llondel.demon.co.uk, dave@llondel.demon.co.uk (David Hough) writes:

>In article <22dsa9\$214@sun1.clark.net> andy@clark.net (Andrew M. Cohn) writes:

>> David Hough (dave@llondel.demon.co.uk) wrote:

>> : In article <22ar7e\$km9@access.digex.net> bote@access.digex.net (John Boteler) writes:

>> : > *ordering food*. This is not a drill, it actually

>> : > says ordering food is no longer restricted.

>> : >

>> : > So be the first on your repeater to order a pizza over

>> : > the autopatch, preferably for the next ham club meeting! :)

>> : >

>> : Does this mean that people can't endlessly debate whether it is legal

>> : anymore? What will they all moan about now? I daresay someone will try and

>> : abolish CW next :-)

>>

>> Knowing that it is OK to order PIZZA via autopatch, the NEXT debate will

>> be whether it's also OK to order a burger and fries instead. ; > K4ADL

>>

>OK.... try this one:

>

>If ordering food, does it have to be for the consumption of the licensee?

>Can you order food on behalf of (a) another ham and (b) an unlicensed person?

>

This kind of question is exactly what the FCC wanted to avoid answering. If you can't figure it out for yourself and have to ask then you probably should not do it. The basic intent was to be more flexible in what could be done on the radio. If your hungry and wanted to order food by autopatch ok. If your friend (licensed or unlicensed) was hungry no problem make your order. Just don't charge your friend for the service. Personally I don't think I will need to order a pizza by ap but to each his own. The main thing to keep in mind is, if you ask for clarification on every scenerio that comes to mind then you have lost sight of the basic intent which is to be more flexible but still remaining non-profit and public service oriented.

Keith

```
+-----+
| Keith E. Thompson  KA6LRR | ket@twobeers.EBay.Sun.COM (Internet)or | |
| Sun Microsystems, Inc. | Keith.Thompson@EBay (Internet) |
| 1210 California Circle | | |
```

| Milpitas, CA |
+-----+

Date: 20 Jul 93 14:25:39 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Profanity was(Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <ZBwq7B1w165w@nraven.wariat.org> floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Douglas Dever) writes:

> I hate to jump topics, but I'm going to.....
>
>Lately I've been hearing about how people are saying the laws
>forbidding profanity are in violation of the 1st amendment.
>I say why don't we take a vote of all the hams and see if they want to
>accept profanity or not. I'd bet over 95% of them would be against
>profanity, and no one could say it wasn't a democratic process. All laws
>passed infringe on people's civil liberties depending on how left you
>are. I mean, it could be said that outlawing murder denies me the right
>to kill other people. Oh well.... I know what everyone's saying... "It's
>not a practical idea." Just a thought.

The Colorado Supreme Court said a profound thing in striking down the anti-gay legislation passed last year in a state referendum. They said that fundamental human rights can't be legislated into, or out of, existence. Our system of government is not a democracy, it's a constitutional republic with certain safeguards against mob rule. Some of our fundamental rights are spelled out in the constitutions and bills of rights of states and the nation, others are implied by the human condition. There's always debate over where to draw the line between rights and license, but it's refreshing to see a court come down on the side of the individual instead of the mob for a change.

I don't like to hear cussing contests on the radio, but I also don't want issues of civility (manners), to become subjects of legislation. The heavy hand of government is easily applied, but difficult to restrain or remove when it goes beyond reason, as it all too frequently does. Better to tolerate a little cussing than let the government begin riding the slippery slope of censorship of speech. It's too easy for the government to go beyond mere words and start censoring ideas.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary

Lawrenceville, GA 30244

Date: 20 Jul 1993 16:54:45 GMT
From: haven.umd.edu!darwin.sura.net!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!concert!
samba.oit.unc.edu!cheech@ames.arpa
Subject: silly season
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In the eastern third of the U.S:

It's hot
It's humid
It's nasty
It's disgusting

In rec.radio.amateur.policy:

It's hot (**FLAME ON** Take that you scumbag You're full of it)
It's nasty
It's disgusting
The no-code war rises again
Incentive licensing rears its ugly head
The ARRL is a bunch money grubbing cretins that are in bed with the
FCC and the equipment manufacturers (menage a trois, anyone?)
Amateur Radio is going to hell in a handbasket because *.*
I know I forgot something here

Yes folks, the silly season is underway early this year. Usually it
waits until the weather gets really ugly in August, but the Bermuda
High has messed things around this year. Those of us in the U.S.
should watch our wallets, because Congress is still in session.

One of these days when I get some spare time (yeah, right. Maybe
from the world's first Internet connected coffin) I'll check the
archives to see if there is a correlation between the weather and the
r.r.a.p flame season. I seem to remember another outbreak back around
cabin fever time. But then some people are always cranky, so who can
tell.

Then again, why would anyone archive megabytes of high temperature
drivel?

Stay cool,

Greg AC4YT

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1993 17:47:51 +0000
From: pipex!libmpcug!demon!llondel.demon.co.uk!dave@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <22ar7e\$km9@access.digex.net>, <743039810snx@llondel.demon.co.uk>,
<22dsa9\$214@sun1.clark.net>un
Reply-To : dave@llondel.demon.co.uk
Subject : Re: Order pizza on your autopatch now

In article <22dsa9\$214@sun1.clark.net> andy@clark.net (Andrew M. Cohn) writes:
> David Hough (dave@llondel.demon.co.uk) wrote:
> : In article <22ar7e\$km9@access.digex.net> bote@access.digex.net (John Boteler)
writes:
> : > *ordering food*. This is not a drill, it actually
> : > says ordering food is no longer restricted.
> : >
> : > So be the first on your repeater to order a pizza over
> : > the autopatch, preferably for the next ham club meeting! :)
> : >
> : Does this mean that people can't endlessly debate whether it is legal
> : anymore? What will they all moan about now? I daresay someone will try and
> : abolish CW next :-)
>
> Knowing that it is OK to order PIZZA via autopatch, the NEXT debate will
> be whether it's also OK to order a burger and fries instead. ; > K4ADL
>
OK.... try this one:

If ordering food, does it have to be for the consumption of the licensee?
Can you order food on behalf of (a) another ham and (b) an unlicensed person?

Dave

* G4WRW @ GB7WRW.#41.GBR.EU AX25 * You think *you* have problems? *
* dave@llondel.demon.co.uk Internet * What do you do if you *are* *
* g4wrw@g4wrw.ampr.org Amprnet * a manically depressed robot?? *

Date: 20 Jul 1993 14:51:57 GMT
From: nothing.ucsd.edu!brian@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CA29oH.Ks@squam.banyan.com>, <221r3aINN55t@bashful.isi.com>,
<16JUL199308294872@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

stocker@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov (ERICH FRANZ STOCKER) writes:
>Every time the discussion moves toward dealing with the relationship of
>code to operations and electronics competency, this lunatic fringe starts
>the response with lets just kill all evaluation.

This is simply because those people realize that it is their skill as
code operators that qualified them for amateur licenses. They know that
when the service requires only technical knowledge, not mechanical
prowess, they will become second-class citizens - unable to compete
among the geniuses and the merely clever.

Yes, the days when one's ability to "pound brass" was sufficient to
guarantee entry into the elite world of amateur radio are drawing to a
close. As the technical requirements of ham radio become greater and
greater, the code operators will find themselves ranked with the
has-been athletes of other forgotten sports. And about time, I say.
- Brian

Date: 20 Jul 93 12:18:26 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!msuinfo!netnews.upenn.edu!
gopher.cs.uofs.edu!bill@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <22ar7e\$km9@access.digex.net>,
<1993Jul19.110351.28366@ennews.eas.asu.edu>,
<CAEyrM.8F5@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU>p
Subject : Re: Order pizza on your autopatch now

Does anyone have a complete copy of the FCC release?? It was said that
this change would also allow the use of Amateur Radio more in support of
education. Was this included? Or is the real thing so vague that we are
going to find ourselves in the same boat we have always been with armchair
lawyers poo-pooing everything we try and do. If in fact the rules have
been made more reasonable and clear, this may be the opportunity we have
needed to start doing things that will garner good PR without having to
wait for an earthquake or a flood.

bill KB3YV

--

Bill Gunshannon | "There are no evil thoughts, Mr. Rearden" Francisco

bill@cs.uofs.edu | said softly, "except one; the refusal to think."
University of Scranton |
Scranton, Pennsylvania | #include <std disclaimer.h>

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1993 16:42:12 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!wjturner@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <221r3aINN55t@bashful.isi.com>,
<16JUL199308294872@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>, <22h0qdINNlpo@network.ucsd.edu>y.iasta
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <22h0qdINNlpo@network.ucsd.edu> brian@nothing.ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor)
writes:

>Yes, the days when one's ability to "pound brass" was sufficient to
>guarantee entry into the elite world of amateur radio are drawing to a
>close. As the technical requirements of ham radio become greater and
>greater, the code operators will find themselves ranked with the
>has-been athletes of other forgotten sports. And about time, I say.
> - Brian

I agree that code should not be the **only** factor, I'm not even sure how much
of a factor it should be, but when in the history of amateur radio (in the US)
was pounding brass **sufficient** to guarantee someone a ham license? From what
I have heard from hams, including one licensed continuously since 1933 or so,
there have always been theory tests, and they used to be completely essay type
tests.

I'm not saying there should not be change, but I would think that the essay
tests given in 1933 would be **slightly** more difficult than today's
"multiple-guess" tests. Thus, "pounding brass" is not, and never has been,
sufficient to guarantee entry into amateur radio.

--
Will Turner, N0RDV -----
wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov -----

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 93 19:08:38 GMT
From: ncrgw2.ncr.com!ncrhub2!torynews!kevin@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <226ft7\$kb@csugrad.cs.vt.edu>,
<1993Jul16.161147.27822@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>,
<POPOVICH.93Jul16133503@cyclades.ma30.bull.com>en.umd.
Subject : Re: Call sign snobbery

In article <POPOVICH.93Jul16133503@cyclades.ma30.bull.com>
popovich@cyclades.ma30.bull.com (Steve Popovich) writes:

>anyway. :-) It's a decent enough CW call, and doesn't seem to have
>quite such obvious embarrassing phonetics on phone.
> -Steve, WB3I (ex-KB3DS, ex-WB3KJD)

Talk about embarrassing phonetics, my call (about 8 months old now) is
KN6FQ. You don't even need phonetics to make that one sound obscene
over the air! I wouldn't trade it for anything.

--

[] [] [] [] [] []	Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ	NCR Torrey Pines
[] [] [] [] []	kevin.sanders@torreypinesca.ncr.com	(619) 597-3602
[] [] [] [] [] []	kevin%beacons@cyber.net	
[] [] [] [] []		
[] [] [] [] [] []	Dump MS-DOS. Prevent Programmer Burnout with Linux.	

Date: 16 Jul 93 12:29:00 GMT
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!ra!cs.umd.edu!
nocusuhs!Pt!skates.gsfc.nasa.gov!nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov!stocker@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul11.054430.6530@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,
<CA29oH.Ks@squam.banyan.com>, <221r3aINN55t@bashful.isi.com>
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <221r3aINN55t@bashful.isi.com>, jerry@isi.com (Jerry Gardner x323)
writes...

>In article <CA29oH.Ks@squam.banyan.com> dts@banyan.com (Daniel Senie) writes:
>>The short answer is that the code tests are a government approved form of
Hazing.

>>This from a government that outlawed hazing...

>

>I absolutely agree with this! The theory tests are another form of hazing too.

>

>I'm in favor of outlawing both the code and theory tests.

>

>

>--

>Jerry Gardner (jerry@isi.com) | "Violence is the last refuge of
>Integrated Systems, Inc. | the incompetent" - Isaac Asimov

Every time the discussion moves toward dealing with the relationship of code to operations and electronics competency, this lunatic fringe starts the response with lets just kill all evaluation. Questioning the code as a measure of competency or its relationship to operating procedures is not an attempt to end all testing.

What needs to happen is that the code speed requirements should be revisited as to their applicability to license differentiations and the written tests need to be revisited to ensure that they contain the appropriate level of material (right now I don't think that they do -- too little theory too much memorization of bands and whether the mariannas are in ITU region 3 or not {what knowledge does that really demonstrate})

No one is trying to eliminate code as an operations mode. You like it you use it. The question is whether speed in this area is the proper differentiator between a Novice and General and Advanced and Extra. Or, should that differentiation be theory and operating procedures including knowledge of the newer digital modes and satellites.

Erich
N3OXM

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #241
